

REVIEW, &c.

THE publication of a correspondence between Mr. M. Morgan, of New-York, and myself and others, which appeared in September last, has naturally led to a rejoinder on his part, which it is my object at present to review, in as calm and unprejudiced a spirit, as the false and calumnious character of its contents will permit.

The nature of the defence adopted by Mr. Morgan, is not only characteristic of the individual, but peculiarly suited to the exigencies of his position.

It will be remembered that my pamphlet established, principally by his own written declarations and those of his emissaries in this city, a series of facts calculated injuriously to affect his reputation as a man of honor, and as the faithful agent of a public institution. Instead of attempting to defend himself against such grave and important charges, he has seen fit to resort to an ingenious but somewhat hackneyed mode of justification, frequently adopted in desperate criminal matters, by which the original offence is attempted to be lost sight of, amidst a cloud of new facts and issues of a totally distinct character.

4

There is another feature about Mr. Morgan's rejoinder which will strike the most casual observer.

From the pseudo-literary reputation of the writer, assisted by the talents of two eminent legal gentlemen known to fame, it was to have been expected that a rich treat was in store for the reading community, and that Mr. Morgan's pamphlet, if not abounding in facts or stamped with the impress of truthfulness, would at least contain some of those literary treasures which his promises had led an expectant public to anticipate.*

But, strange to say, if his production be remarkable for a total want of candor and manliness, refuting nothing and proving nothing; whining about obligations conferred, and favors gratuitously bestowed; of which I shall presently show the preponderance to have been on the other side; it is still more extraordinary for its gross grammatical blunders and total want of style; the defects in which, however, are amply made up by the constant use of the great pronoun I, which comes first in a couple, "I and Mr. Wilkinson"; and words of "learned length and thundering sound," of which the phrase, "*Inferentially and by insinuation and innuendo*," is a fair example.

But to comment on all the want of grammar, system, decency and sense in his pamphlet, would be swelling out this publication beyond all reasonable bounds, and I proceed to matters of more importance.

If the publication of Mr. Morgan can be understood as having any objects distinctly in view, they are, as far

* "My friends will smile when they learn that I *intend* seriously to answer them." See page 4 of Morgan's pamphlet.

as I can understand, to impress upon the minds of his readers in the first place, the fact that I had been the recipient for a series of years of numerous obligations and favors from him, which were entirely gratuitous; and in the second, that he had no motive whatever in conspiring with Mr. Wilkinson for the purpose of removing me from the Presidency of the Canal Bank.

In very briefly disposing of the first, and showing on which side the weight of obligation lies; which can fortunately be done from authentic documents within my reach, the reader will readily arrive at a proper understanding of the second. *It was much more desirable for Mr. Morgan to have a tool of his own at the head of the Bank, than an independent officer who considered the interests of the Institution as of the first, and those of the New-York agent as of secondary importance.*

I am necessarily drawn, when considering the first point, into a brief history of my connection with the Bank; and I hope I may not suffer under the charge of egotism, in speaking of myself, as intimately associated with that Institution. Reference must also be had to the state of commercial and financial affairs existing at that period.

It is well known that out of *twelve* Banks of this State only *five* attempted to resume specie payments, under the Banking law of 1841; and of those *five* the Canal Bank was one—the principal portion of whose stock was, at that time, held in New-York and Europe; although necessarily subjected to the control of a local Board of Directors, of which I was then for the first time elected a member, and for which office, in common with

the rest of the board, I had become qualified by the purchase of *ten shares* of stock only.

Upon taking possession of the Bank, an examination showed the deposits to be extremely small, with *eighteen hundred dollars* in the vaults, to meet a circulation of about \$ 60,000, as appeared from the books ; and the fear that the example of a neighboring Bank, in *doubling the Book Circulation*, might have been followed in this.

Scarcely had the new board organized before a clamorous crowd of hungry note-holders were besieging the doors, demanding specie. After a protracted session, the *then* President felt himself justified in declaring that there was nothing to be done, except to "let the rotten institution go." Everything was dismay and confusion. The hour for opening the Bank had passed ; there was no helping hand, and the *first unpaid five dollar note* would, under the law, bring with it a forfeiture of the charter.

The then president, seeing no hope of assistance, and justified by the concurrence of a majority of the board, proposed to resign his post. Believing fully in the eventual solvency of the Bank, I volunteered to interpose my personal means and exertions between the Bank and ruin. My offers were accepted. Withdrawing from other Banks a sum necessary for the purpose, which was standing to the credit of my house, I returned with the notes to the Bank, of which I had so recently become a director, not having time to obtain the specie ; exchanged these notes for those presented at the counter, until the run was stopped, every

one satisfied, and order restored. The interests of the stockholders, and the gratification of a natural feeling of pride, for the character of the institution, with which I was connected, formed the sole inducement, as they did the only compensation, for the responsibility I thus incurred.

I continued in the office of President, assumed under these threatening auspices, for a period of eight years, during which period I acquired a deep interest in the institution, the stock having, in the mean time, risen from \$10 per share to \$80.

I now come to the appointment of Mr. Morgan as the New-York Agent, which event occurred about two years after the circumstances just narrated, and which was effected entirely through my personal influence.

At that period Mr. Morgan was an obscure stranger in New-York, although considered there as well as here respectable, his character being *then* but imperfectly known. Let us see what position he *now* occupies, and what substantial benefits have accrued to him through this appointment conferred by me. The statement of one year's commissions and profits, taken from the books of the Bank, will afford some basis for calculation.

I hold in my possession an elaborate and detailed statement of profits realized by Mr. Morgan, too long to warrant its publication here, prepared by Mr. Abrams while exchange clerk of the Canal Bank, which affords data for the following.

From October, 1847 to October, 1848, Mr. Morgan charged for commissions and perquisites nearly \$27,000. From October, 1848, to May, 1849, *eight months*, he

charged nearly \$11,000. In September afterwards he stated in a letter, that for endorsing and his share of profits there were then due him \$10,000—making in all for the year 1849, \$21,000. Besides which his operations in New York, with the means and credit of the Canal Bank, could not perhaps have been less than an equal annual sum.

The following statement in Mr. Morgan's handwriting was copied from the original by the same clerk, Mr. Abrams.

Exchange received on the purchases of New-Orleans funds from	
November, 1846, to 30th October, 1848,.....	\$ 27,757 40
Gain on transfer of 4 millions dollars, as per arrangement with the	
Treasury Department, 18th June and 19th Aug., 1847, $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ cent.,	30,000 00
Gain on \$ 360,000 paid into the Sub-Treasury at New-Orleans, under	
agreement with Corcoran & Riggs, 1 ¢ cent.....	3,600 00
	<hr/>
	\$ 61,357 40

One fourth, \$ 15,339 85

For endorsing ——— millions, sterling, and francs, drawing about	
£ 70,000 on credits from Rothschilds and Overend, Gurney &	
Co., postages, sundry expenses and for services in collecting	
and settling claims upon sundry parties, corresponding with the	
agent sent to Europe,.....	4,660 15
	<hr/>
	\$ 20,000 00

1848.	Cr.	
May 9.	On account of the above,.....	\$ 2000
11.	“ “	2000
19.	“ “	1000
June 23.	“ “	3000
July 15.	“ “	1000
Aug. 18.	“ “	5000
Oct. 28.	“ “	6000
		<hr/>
		\$ 20,000

The accuracy of the foregoing is proved by the subjoined note from Mr. Abrams:

The statement of Mr. Morgan's commissions (now in the possession of Mr. Burke,) made up while I was exchange clerk in the Canal Bank, exhibits the sum of \$ 26,627 71 charged from October, 1847, to October, 1848; and \$ 10,694 76 from October, 1848, to May, 1849, inclusive.

M. ABRAMS.

The *gratuitous obligations and benefits* conferred by Mr. Morgan, which are set forth so conspicuously and prominently in almost every page of his pamphlet, received in return ONLY the equivalent of an appointment of from \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year; which, together with the advantages attached to it, have, in a very short period converted him from a somewhat humble and retired man, of moderate means, into that of a scheming and intriguing Wall street operator. The whole of the bills of Burke, Watt & Co., and of my present firm on Mr. Morgan, having invariably been provided for *before* due, he has never advanced a dollar for either firm one hour in his life, and upon my authority to him, of which he has availed himself from time to time, whenever it suited his purposes, he has drawn bills of exchange on my house in New Orleans, without any charge for accepting them having ever been made.

Let us now advert briefly to another prominent actor in this little drama—one whose connection with Mr. Morgan must seem a mystery to most readers, until explained by what I am about to relate; and which will naturally form the second subject of this publication.

Upon my assumption of the office of President, as already narrated, it became absolutely necessary to have some young and efficient person to fill the office of Assistant Cashier of the Bank. At my personal request, Mr. N. N. Wilkinson was selected for this office; he being then in destitute circumstances, and anxious to take this or any other place which would offer a support, however humble. The additional expense at that

period was a matter of consideration, and anxious to adopt any economy which might conduce to the interests of the institution, I forthwith abandoned any claim to which I might have been entitled as Président, for the purpose of conferring upon this new functionary a compensation adequate to his services. This compensation deserves to be mentioned. At first only \$2500 per annum, it was increased finally, at my suggestion, to \$6000 per annum, and a commission of two and a half per cent. upon the *nett* profits of the Bank after the declaration of the dividend. *No cashier ever had a greater inducement to be honest.*

This sudden change in the affairs of Mr. Wilkinson to some degree turned his head. He thought himself a capitalist, and to a great extent at the head of financial affairs, and ripe for every species of bank and stock speculation.

It is difficult to conjecture from whom the first overtures came which finally led to the transactions in Canal Bank stock between Morgan and Wilkinson. It is sufficient to convict the former from proof which cannot be contradicted, and which in truth is embodied in his own letters,* of a knowledge and approbation of underhanded dealings, if not a participation in them between Wilkinson, himself and other parties.

Seeing the weakness of Wilkinson, the idea seems suddenly to have struck Morgan that direct negotiations might be opened between himself and the Cashier. It

* The fuss made about your speculation, is too ridiculous in Burke. Instead of the Bank taking the stock, I think it would be better to send it here. IF THINGS PASS OFF QUIETLY, it will bring \$75 ex dividend.—*Morgan's Letter to Wilkinson*, 26th June, 1849.

will be apparent to the reader from the letter referred to, that Morgan's hope of having "*things pass off quietly*," meant the hope of "*getting rid*" of me and my supervisory power altogether. Could he get me removed, and Wilkinson appointed in my stead, he had the bank to a great extent under his own control, and the speculations of Wilkinson ran much less risk of exposure.

In his pamphlet and in his remarks to some of my friends, Mr. Morgan exhibits an extreme sensitiveness at this charge of conspiracy with Mr. Wilkinson to injure me. As will be seen in my letter of the 20th December, 1849, to which I particularly refer, it is not only sustained beyond all doubts by the facts of the case, but by the direct admission of Mr. Wilkinson himself, which admission, a confession of Wilkinson, was immediately made known to Mr. George Morgan, as stated in my letter, and very soon afterwards to Mr. Morgan himself. If untrue the charge should have been met with a denial *at the time*; but I am entirely convinced of the truth of the charge against Mr. Morgan, as also of all that I have stated linking Morgan and Wilkinson together, and from certain facts known to me, I am confident that Mr. Morgan, even up to *this time*, has to keep certain terms with Mr. Wilkinson; and that it would not suit him to throw Wilkinson off altogether.

Mr. Morgan persists too in his assertion that the "*fuss made about Mr. Wilkinson, the Cashier's speculation in stock, was too ridiculous*," and that my acts dismissing the Cashier, &c., produced by the development, were "*desperate*" and "*crazy*." This very letter of the

26th June, 1849, my readers must particularly observe was written by Morgan to Wilkinson, AFTER MORGAN HAD BEEN INFORMED AT NEW YORK, by letter and by telegraph, of the Cashier's exposure before the Board of Directors here on the 12th, *fourteen* days previous to the date of it. Does not this letter of the 26th of June, 1849, form an admirable text for bank officers? What would the presiding officers of those old and time-honored monied institutions of New York think of being presented with such a code of bank ethics for the government of their cashiers? And what must be the reflection of the New York and foreign stockholders of the Canal Bank, in knowing that such a letter as Morgan's, justifying the Cashier's stock speculations with the money of the Bank, still exists in the archives of the Bank—such a letter from their all important *employé*, their New York agent? Should not this letter, or its writer *be expunged*, to show a proper and honest denunciation of its doctrines?

Not wishing to fatigue my readers, I leave to them the questions, whether I have not fully and fairly succeeded in establishing the two points which I proffered to establish at starting: first, that the weight of obligations for benefits conferred was on the side of Mr. Morgan to me; and, secondly, that he had all sufficient motives for having me removed, and Mr. Wilkinson, a pliant tool, appointed in my place.

I am sorry that I cannot close here, but the palpable turpitude, baseness and ingratitude on the part of Wilkinson, and the treachery of his confederate, Morgan, developed as well by the foregoing extracts of the

letters published in my pamphlet, as the correspondence with which Mr. Morgan has enriched his pamphlet, at page 18, demand some further notice.

What secret page of history could develope a more tortuous course than Morgan's letter, to Wilkinson, p. 18? "*I hope the matter will pass off without occasion for your and my appearing as having any agency or knowledge of it, EXCEPT in our official relations; and don't wish you to say any thing that will create the inference with Burke that I have written to you about it.*"

Mr. Morgan repels with holy horror the idea that this should be charged as a *secret* correspondence! Writing to Wilkinson and myself at the same time—to me with the apparent frankness of an old and tried friend, styling me "*dear Burke,*" and in the same terms as had been used for many years past; endeavoring to disarm suspicion, if any had existed on my part; and, almost by the same mail, cautioning his confederate, Wilkinson, *to watch me well*, to avoid all appearance of any agency between them, and not even *to say* any thing that will create the impression with me that they have corresponded with each other.

My suspicions, however, *were* aroused, and I began to conceive something like a just estimate of the persons with whom I was dealing. I did not certainly descend to the dishonorable, ungentlemanly and discreditable course adopted by Mr. Morgan; of violating the most sacred amenities and courtesies of social life, in publishing confidential letters, *marked* as such. Perhaps my files of confidential letters from Mr. Morgan would prove more fatal to him than those from me, the

confidence of which he has violated. But I would have considered this a desecration of which not even Matthew Morgan himself could have been guilty. My suspicions once aroused I could not rest satisfied until I had ascertained and exposed, as already appears by my pamphlet, the whole extent of the iniquities practised by Morgan and Wilkinson—their secret correspondence—their fraudulent stock operations—their endeavors to overshadow the local interests of the Bank in Louisiana, by an overwhelming representation of wealthy stockholders at New York, and their suberviency to the *interests of the stockholders* to those of themselves.

Nor was I alone. The entire Board of Directors, after the dismissal of the Cashier, became equally doubtful as well as suspicious of the New York agent, and placed the fate of that functionary in my hands. This will be shown by the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Board :

NEW ORLEANS CANAL AND BANKING COMPANY.

Extract from the Minutes of the Board of Directors, at a Special Meeting, held this day, Monday, July 9th, 1849.

Resolved, That leave of absence be and is hereby granted to GLENDY BURKE, Esq., President of the Bank, who is hereby invested with full powers to control all moneys and assets belonging to the Bank, at New York and elsewhere, to adjust any business arrangements he may deem proper with any Agent or Correspondent of this Bank, or other party. *To remove or change any Agent or Correspondent now in connection with this Bank that he may consider necessary and requisite for the interests of this institution.*

SAMUEL C. BELL, *Cashier.*

Armed with this power, and clothed with this authority, I proceeded to New-York, and had an interview with Mr. Morgan. *Without it, I had been nothing. With it, I was everything!* Reputation, character,

financial operations, and his ultimate success and position were dependent upon the agency of the Canal Bank.

My pocket to him was as important as that of Gen. Jackson's to the United States Bank, when he carried away the Bill—for it contained the resolution which authorised me to remove or retain him in power.

Unconscious of the danger with which he was threatened, he at first, in the presence of a third person, assumed the dignified. When left together, and apprised, for the first time, of the power placed in my hands, it would have amused my readers to have observed the difference. It was a change indeed—for it caused some contortions of countenance; while “the big round tears coursed one another down his innocent nose, in piteous chase.”

A sudden gush of feelings, long since forgotten, seemed at once to flash across his memory, when this ominous looking document stared him in the face. To these he appealed for succor and for safety. Nor was his appeal in vain. He was continued in office. Now let us see what follows.

The first step in his path of repentance was his offer to me of facilities to the extent of \$100,000, coupled with expressions of regret for his past conduct, and withdrawal of confidence, as already developed. I once more had the weakness to repose confidence in his sincerity, and upon my return to New-Orleans, addressed to him the “*confidential*” letter, containing the names of mutual friends, the publication of which, I believe that all mercantile, as well as other friends, will denounce as unworthy of any one aspiring to the title

of a gentleman. This, however, is only consummating the plan of suppressing portions of my letters, which were essential to a proper understanding of the whole; and without which he was enabled to place upon them such an interpretation as would suit his own views. Indeed the publication of all letters from page 19 to page 22, written after what I had supposed to be a full and frank reconciliation and in renewed confidence, is a breach of honor which should forever exclude him from the society of gentlemen.

One or two other matters demand a passing remark, and I have done.

The memory of the dead has been considered sacred by the most debased savages and in the darkest ages. There is something abhorrent to the feelings of every gentleman and every christian in invoking the forgotten dead, to substantiate the lying living! But, in his desperation, Mr. Morgan has violated even the sanctity of the grave. I shall not follow him in a course so shocking to every well wisher of social and christian life. He publishes letters to Mr. George Morgan, (some time dead,) written as early as March, 1848, of a secret and injurious character in relation to myself, in order to sanction his position in reference to the dishonor of my drafts on the first of June, 1849; of which he alleges I had been admonished in advance. It must be remembered that these letters, if written at all, of which the only evidence consists in the doubtful assertion of Mr. Morgan himself; were of an *inquisitorial* character, and that I was necessarily in utter ignorance either of their existence or contents. I had no intimation or knowledge that such letters were ever written,

and yet Mr. Morgan has the temerity to publish them, as being evidence of admonition *to me* not to draw on him. This correspondence carried on with Mr. George Morgan, occurred at the same period with the Wilkinson letters, already referred to, and pointed to the same result with regard to myself, in case I should prove refractory or troublesome, in reference to their joint operations before stated.

Without the slightest reason to warrant it, security was required for the pitiful sum of \$15,000. Security was given. But Mr. Morgan, again forgetful of the motto, "*Of the dead, say but what is good*"—once more attacks the dead, by the declaration that the security turns out to be, "*the note of a person who was deceased, being no security at all,*" and thus summarily disposes of the matter.

Now what are the facts? The security thus deprecated consisted of notes of the late William Bisland, amounting in all to about \$45,000, bearing *first and only mortgage* upon a plantation and slaves in the parish of Terrebonne, Louisiana, capable of producing 1000 hogsheads of sugar at a crop, worth upon an average \$50,000 per annum. The most conclusive proof of the value of this security is found in the fact, that Messrs. Washington Jackson & Co., of this city, paid me, last spring, the last of the notes. But this wicked calumny will best be answered by the declarations of a gentleman whose life and character offer a strong contrast to those of its author. I refer the reader to the following note from Dr. Stephen Duncan, of Natchez, whom I am proud to number among my friends, and whose guarantee will be sufficient to satisfy the most incredulous.

To G. BURKE, Esq.,

NATCHEZ, DEC. 2, 1850.

DEAR SIR: — In reply to your letter of 28th ult., I can say with perfect confidence, that the notes of Wm. Bisland without the mortgage security would have been considered by me undoubtedly good. With the mortgage security, I would say no better paper could be made.

Respectfully yours,
STEPHEN DUNCAN.

Thus it will be seen that this point is disposed of.

The deliberate assertion that I knew, long anterior to their disclosure, all about Mr. Wilkinson's speculations in the Bank, deserves a passing notice,

This is attempted to be proved by a garbled portion of my letter to Mr. Morgan, *dated the 1st June, 1849*, written, it will be observed, just *twelve* days before the disclosures took place. If the allegation were true, it follows that I had this knowledge but *twelve* days previous to its being communicated by me to the Board of Directors. BUT IT IS NOT TRUE IN A SINGLE PARTICULAR.

The letter of the 1st June, 1849, refers exclusively to the *Cashier's aspirations to the Presidency of the Bank*, and is so expressed in that letter, and not to any speculations of which he had been guilty during several years before; for to have known these facts was next to impossible, so adroitly were they concealed from view,

Nor was it in the nature of things that I could have known what required the most vigilant examination of the clerks afterwards to discover, even with the knowledge on their part, of the object of their search. Neither could it reasonably have been expected that with a salary of \$ 1500 per annum, that I could give my undivided attention to the business of the Bank, by which means alone a critical knowledge of its DETAILS could be known. The confidence we all had in the Cashier naturally induced us to entrust the details to him, and

this was well known, not only to all persons here, *but to Morgan himself, as shown throughout his correspondence.* The cashier's conduct at the Board, during my absence, is so fully shown by the communication of Mr. Perret and Mr. Barrière, published in my pamphlet, to have been base and untruthful, that taken in connection with the information just conveyed to me of his aspirations to the Presidency, which a sense of duty had at once prompted me to communicate to Mr. Morgan a few days before, aroused in me not only a feeling of indignation at that conduct on the part of the Cashier, but most naturally led to the inquiry of what could have prompted it. Accosting him in pretty decided terms with the charge that something was surely wrong with him—that my personal bearing had ever been most unexceptionable towards him, that his unwarrantable and secret hostility must have proceeded from causes with the origin of which he alone was acquainted, and abruptly demanding if he owed money to the Bank, he answered, after great hesitation, *that something was due by him*, finally admitting, what he did afterwards to the Board of Directors, that he owed \$40,000; which proved in the end to be over \$150,000. Impelled by the conviction that, as all effects have causes, so his deportment in my absence must have proceeded from what he felt interested in concealing, and of which I was totally ignorant, this enquiry was made of him, and the response astounded me, as it did afterwards every member of the Board. We were totally unprepared for it.

It will thus be seen that I have successfully refuted by strong and most conclusive evidence every matter

of charge set forth against me by my adversary, in the body of his pamphlet, and which he has attempted to sustain by false and perverted statements of facts, mutilated letters, and other inventions, of most dishonorable though ingenious malice. It finally becomes my duty, however loathsome the task, to honor with a passing notice the ungentlemanly and dishonest inuendoes contained in his postscript.

Having impressed into his service every shadow of fact that could give his case a plausible coloring, he is driven to the contemptible artifice of pretending to have withheld the true reasons which influenced the stockholders in the withdrawal of their confidence from the man whose individual means had been employed to save their institution from ruin, and who is stigmatised, with shameless disregard for truth, as being in "needy circumstances." Had such been the case, I should never have blamed the Agent for advocating my removal, *his* early practice and experience having necessarily brought *him* to the conclusion that it is impossible for a man in "needy circumstances" to preserve his integrity.

To conclude: in dismissing Mr. Morgan to the intellectual obscurity out of which he has so suddenly emerged, and consigning him to the position in which he is so likely to be placed in the minds of honorable men, I feel willing, out of charity alone, to allow him the use of a title, nowhere to be found in *my* pamphlet, but which he has himself adopted in his own, and thus bid a final farewell to "*Morgan, the perfidious.*"

G. BURKE.

NEW ORLEANS, December 10, 1850.